

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/039,048	12/31/2001	Adrian Crisan	200302266-1	2291	
7590 08/24/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			LABAZE,	LABAZE, EDWYN	
LEGAL DEPARTMENT M/S 35			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	PO BOX 272400 FT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/039,048	CRISAN, ADRIAN			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		EDWYN LABAZE	2876			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the c				
Period fo	or Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailied ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day if will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nety filed rs will be considered timety. I the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[🗆	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	May 2005.				
·		is action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4) 🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15 and 26-41</u> is/are pending in the application.					
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15,36 and 37</u> is/are allowed.					
6)🖂	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>26-35 and 38-41</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat	ion No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	ed in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
`	see the attached detailed Office action for a na	it of the certified copies not receive	su.			
Attachmen	at(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

1. Receipt is acknowledged of amendments filed on 5/26/2005.

2. Claims 1-15 and 26-41 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 26-35, 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Otsuka (U.S 6,563,923) in view of Krishnan (U.S. 6,377,685).

Otsuka discloses portable telephone and character input method, which includes a key [as

shown in fig. # 1] having a first data entry value associated with depressing a first portion [herein

the position is described as one of the contact points 14 a-c, to which a data value is associated

when depressing said contact position] of the key (col.4, lines 7+); the key having a second data

entry value [Otsuka discloses in fig. # 9 that each key {6f-6m} has a first and a second data

entry values associated with the key and that each entry value corresponds to a contact point 14a-

14d shown in fig. # 1] associated with deflecting the key in a predetermined direction toward a

second portion of the key different from the first portion (col.4, lines 10+); the key having a user

readable indication of the first, second and third data entry values [as shown in fig. # 9], and

where the key is adapted for being displaced by a human fingertip (although not disclosed, but

inherently known in the art that depressing a key in a portable telephone keypad is adapted for being displaced by a human fingertip, or a pen and the like; as exemplified by the examiner in

US reference 5,528,235 of Lin et al. {figs. # 4-5}).

Otsuka fails to teach a multifunctional key having a central portion and wherein is of the central portion and peripheral portions is displaceable to reference a different one of the plurality of discrete data entry values.

Krishnan discloses cluster management, which a multifunctional key 12 [as shown in figs. # 1-4; 6A-7; 9] having a central portion [herein disclosed as the primary key 12/112/121] and wherein is of the central portion and peripheral portions [herein disclosed as the secondary keys 34/36/38/40; 104; 156] is displaceable to reference a different one of the plurality of discrete data entry values (col.19, lines 30-67; col.20, lines 1-15), a QWERTY keyboard (col.24, lines 1-32).

In view of Krishnan's teachings, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a multifunctional key having a central portion and wherein is of the central portion and peripheral portions is displaceable to reference a different one of the plurality of discrete data entry values so as to separate the primary key from the secondary avoiding any possible erred input entry. Furthermore, such modification would clearly help the user inputting the correct data entry, wherein the primary key contact point is more exposed to the center of the key and cover a larger surface area, wherein the secondary keys are arranged to the outer periphery of the primary key. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Otsuka.

5. Claims 1-15 and 36-37 are allowed.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, taken alone or in combination with any other references, fails to teach a

data entry device comprising of a key having third data entry value associated with

simultaneously depressing and deflecting the key in a predetermined direction to engage both the

first and second portions of the key. These limitations in conjunction with other limitations in the

claimed invention were not shown by the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicant argues that it would have not been obvious to combine the teachings of the

prior art, Otsuka (U.S. 6,563,923) in view of Krishnan (U.S. 6,377,685) to produce the claimed

invention (see page 10, of applicant's arguments).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's remarks because Otsuka does

teach part of the limitations of the claimed invention (i.e. means of depressing {which is by

definition pushing down, as shown in fig.# 1} a multifunctional key). Furthermore, Claims 26-35

and 38-41 do recite the allowable subject matter. Therefore, the examiner believes that Otsuka,

taken alone or in combination with Krishnan, anticipate the limitations of claims 25-35, and the

examiner retains the rejections as set forth above.

Page 5

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Chang (U.S. 6,320,942) discloses directionally mapped, keyed alphanumeric data

input/output system.

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to EDWYN LABAZE whose telephone number is (571) 272-2395.

The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/039,048

Art Unit: 2876

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

el Edwyn Labaze Patent Examiner Art Unit 2876 August 17, 2005

THIEN M. LE PRIMARY EXAMINER